

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/737,446	01/10/1997	JOHN DUPRE	223/051	5209
7590 02/26/2002				
BRADFORD J. DUFT ESQ. BROBECK,PHLEGER & HARRISON LLP. 12390 EL CAMINO REAL SAN DIEGO. CA 92130			EXAMINER	
			NOLAN, PATRICK J	
SAN DIEGO, C	SAN DIEGO, CA 92130		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1644	27
			DATE MAILED: 02/26/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No. 08/737,446 Applicant(s)

Dupre

Examiner

Art Unit



Patrick J. Nolan 1644 -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address -Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). **Status** 1) X Responsive to communication(s) filed on Oct 31, 2001 2a) X This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4) X Claim(s) 38-52 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above, claim(s) ______ is/are withdrawn from consideratio 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) X Claim(s) 38-52 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to. are subject to restriction and/or election requirement 8) Claims **Application Papers** 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on ______ is/are objected to by the Examiner. 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: all approved by disapproved. 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 13) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d). a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e). Attachment(s) 15) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 18) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). 16) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 19) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 17) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s).

Serial Number 08/737,446

Art Unit: 1644

Part III DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 38-52 are pending.

Double Patenting

The non-statutory double patenting rejection, whether of the obviousness-type or non-obviousness-type, is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent. In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); and In re Goodman, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(b) and [©] may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a non-statutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.78(d). Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 38-52 stand provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 15-34- of copending Application No. 09/280,020.

Applicant has indicated that a terminal disclaimer will be filed when allowable subject has been indicated.

The rejection is maintained.

The new ground of rejection is necessitated by Applicant's amendment filed 10-31-01

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Serial Number 08/737,446 Art Unit: 1644

4. Claims 50-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

There is insufficient written description to show that Applicant was in possession of any "glucagon-like peptide 1 related peptide" capable of treating insulin-requiring diabetes in a mammal, other than the peptides disclosed in the specification and those analogues already disclosed in the art. The term "glucagon-like peptide 1 related peptide", would include an essentially unlimited number of undefined compounds. One of skill in the art would therefore conclude that the specification fails to disclose a representative number of species to describe the claimed genus. See Eli Lilly, 119 F.d. 1559, 43 USPQ2d 1398. Applicant is further directed to:

Written description guidelines from the Federal Register Vol. 66, No. 4, Friday January 5, 2001

For each claim drawn to a genus:

The written description requirement for a claimed genus may be satisfied through sufficient description of a representative number of species by actual reduction to practice, reduction to drawings, or by disclosure of relevant, identifying characteristics, i.e., structure or other physical and/or chemical properties, functional characteristics coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or by a combination of such identifying characteristics, sufficient to show the applicant was in possession of the claimed genus. A 'representative number of species'' means that the species which are adequately described are representative of the entire genus. Thus, when there is substantial variation within the genus, one must describe a sufficient variety of species to reflect the variation within the genus. On the other hand, there may be situations where one species adequately supports a genus.55 What constitutes a 'representative number'' is an inverse function of the skill and knowledge in the art. Satisfactory disclosure of a ''representative number''depends on whether one of skill in the art would recognize that the applicant was in possession of the necessary common attributes or features of the elements possessed by the members of the genus in view of the species disclosed. For inventions in an unpredictable art, adequate written description of a genus which embraces widely variant species cannot be achieved by disclosing only one species

Serial Number 08/737,446 Art Unit: 1644

within the genus.56 Description of a representative number of species does not require the description to be of such specificity that it would provide individual support for each species that the genus embraces. If a representative number of adequately described species are not disclosed for a genus, the claim to that genus must be rejected as lacking adequate written description under 35 USC 112 1st paragraph.

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for response to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the date of this action. In the event a first response is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event will the statutory period for response expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

- 5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrick Nolan whose telephone number is (703) 305-1987. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8:30 am to 4:30 pm.
- 6. If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Chan, can be reached at (703) 305-3973. The FAX number for our group, 1644, is (703) 305-7401.

Patrick J. Nolan, Ph.D.

Primary Examiner, Group 1640

February 25, 2002

Patrice I Nor